arXiv:1608.03701v1 [math.AP] 12 Aug 2016

Tug-of-war games with varying probabilities and the normalized $p(x)$-Laplacian

Ángel Arroyo, Joonas Heino and Mikko Parviainen

August 15, 2016

Abstract

We study a tug-of-war game with varying probabilities. In particular, we show that the value of the game is locally asymptotically Hölder continuous. We also show the existence and uniqueness of values of the game. As an application, we prove that the value function of the game converges to a solution of the normalized $p(x)$-Laplacian.

1 Introduction

The seminal works of Crandall, Evans, Ishii, Lions, Souganidis and others established a connection between the stochastic differential games and viscosity solution to Bellman-Isaacs equations in the early 80s. However, a similar connection between the p-Laplace or ∞-Laplace equations and the tug-of-war games with noise was discovered only rather recently in [PS08, PSSW09].

In this paper we study a tug-of-war with noise with space dependent probabilities, which is a natural generalization of the original tug-of-war both from mathematical and application point of views. In particular, we prove that the value functions of the game in this setting are asymptotically Hölder continuous, Theorem 4.1. Here the main difficulty is the loss of translation invariance so that the global or local regularity methods in [PS08], [MPR12] or [LPS13] are not directly applicable. Instead, we employ the method in [LP].

The main idea is to consider two game sequences simultaneously. Heuristically speaking, in a higher dimensional space, the sequences can be linked to a single higher dimensional game by introducing a probability measure that has the measures of the original game as marginals through suitable couplings. It is interesting to note that couplings of stochastic processes

2010 *Mathematics subject classification.* 35J60, 35J92, 35B65, 91A15.

Key words and phrases. coupling of stochastic processes, dynamic programming principle, local Hölder continuity, normalized $p(x)$-Laplacian, stochastic games, tug-of-war, viscosity solutions.

can be employed in the study of regularity for second order linear uniformly parabolic equations with continuous highest order coefficients, see for example [LR86], [PW06], and [Kus15]. The method has also some similarities to the Ishii-Lions method [IL90], see also [PP13]. However, the method we use does not rely on the theorem of sums in the theory of viscosity solutions nor does it use stochastic tools. Indeed, it applies directly to functions satisfying a dynamic programming equation whether they arise from the stochastic games or numerical methods to PDEs.

One of the key tools in studying the tug-of-war games is the dynamic programming principle. For the game in this paper, the dynamic programming principle (DPP) reads as

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) = \frac{1-\delta(x)}{2}\Bigg[&\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\left(\alpha(x)u(x+\nu)+\beta(x)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right) \\ &+\inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\left(\alpha(x)u(x+\nu)+\beta(x)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right)\Bigg] \\ &+\delta(x)F(x) \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

with a given boundary cut-off function δ, a boundary function F and space-dependent probabilities $\alpha(x), \beta(x)$. Here, B_ε^ν denotes the $(n-1)$-dimensional ball orthogonal to ν. For more details, see Section 2. Heuristic idea behind the DPP is that the value at a point can be obtained by considering a single step in the game and summing up all the possible outcomes. At the point x, the game continues with a probability $1-\delta(x)$. In this case, the maximizer selects the direction $\nu_{\max}$ of fixed radius maximizing the expected payoff at the point. Similarly, the minimizer selects the direction $\nu_{\min}$ of the same radius minimizing the expectation. Then with a probability $\alpha(x)/2$, the game moves to $x+\nu_{\max}$ in the single step, and with the same probability, the game moves to $x+\nu_{\min}$. With a probability $\beta(x)/2$, the next game point is $x+\nu'_{\max}$, where $\nu'_{\max}$ is chosen according to the uniform distribution in a $(n-1)$-dimensional ball orthogonal to $\nu_{\max}$. Similarly with the same probability, the next game point is $x+\nu'_{\min}$, where $\nu'_{\min}$ is chosen uniformly random from a $(n-1)$-dimensional ball orthogonal to $\nu_{\min}$. If the game on the other hand stops at x, the payoff is given by the boundary function F at the point.

The first step in the paper is to show that a value function satisfy the dynamic programming principle above and that the value is unique. This is Theorem 3.7. We first prove existence of a measurable function satisfying the DPP by iterating the operator on the right hand side of (1.1). To this end, we guarantee the continuity and thus Borel measurability of the iterands by the boundary correction in the DPP above. Otherwise it is difficult to guarantee the measurability in such iterations. Then, the uniqueness and

the continuity of the solution is obtained by using game theoretic arguments. In particular, we show that the solution coincides with the game value.

As an application, by using the regularity result, Arzelà-Ascoli's theorem and the DPP, we show in Theorem 6.2 that the values of the game converge to a continuous viscosity solution of the normalized $p(x)$-Laplace equation

$$\Delta_{p(x)}^N u(x) := \Delta u(x) + (p(x)-2)\Delta_\infty^N u(x) = 0,$$

where $\Delta_\infty^N u := |\nabla u|^{-2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n u_{x_i x_j} u_{x_i} u_{x_j}$ is the normalized infinity Laplacian, and $p : \overline{\Omega} \to (1,\infty)$ is a continuous function on the closure of the game domain Ω with $\inf_\Omega p > 1$ and $\sup_\Omega p < \infty$. Observe that we cover the range $1 < p(x) < \infty$. To guarantee that the limit takes the same boundary values, we need boundary estimates which are obtained in Theorem 5.2 by using barrier arguments.

Acknowledgements. Part of this research was done during a visit of Á. A. to the University of Jyväskylä in 2015. Á. A. was partially supported by grants MTM2011-24606, MTM2014-51824-P and 2014 SGR 75. M. P. was supported by the Academy of Finland project #260791.

2 Preliminaries

Fix $n \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain. For measurability reasons, we need the boundary correction function δ in the dynamic programming principle. Thus, we define the following open sets

$$\begin{aligned} I_\varepsilon &= \{x \in \Omega : \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega) < \varepsilon\}, \\ O_\varepsilon &= \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega} : \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega) < \varepsilon\} \end{aligned}$$

and the set $\Omega_\varepsilon := \overline{\Omega} \cup O_\varepsilon$. The function $\delta : \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon \to [0,1]$ is given by

$$\delta(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in \Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon \\ 1 - \varepsilon^{-1} \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\Omega) & \text{if } x \in I_\varepsilon \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in \overline{O}_\varepsilon. \end{cases}$$

Let p be a continuous function on $\overline{\Omega}$ satisfying

$$1 < p_{\min} := \inf_{x\in\Omega} p(x) \leq \sup_{x\in\Omega} p(x) =: p_{\max} < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

To prove the existence and uniqueness of continuous solutions to (1.1) in Section 3, we utilize the uniform continuity of p. In Section 4 and in Section 5, the regularity results require only measurability for the function p and (2.1). In applications in Section 6, we use the continuity of p again. We

define the functions $\alpha, \beta : \overline{\Omega} \to (0,1)$ depending on $p(x)$ and the dimension n by

$$\alpha(x) = \frac{p(x)-1}{p(x)+n} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(x) = 1-\alpha(x) = \frac{n+1}{p(x)+n}.$$

By the assumptions on $p(x)$, the functions α and β are uniformly continuous. In addition, we have

$$\alpha_{\max} := \sup_{x\in\Omega} \alpha(x) < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{\min} := \inf_{x\in\Omega} \alpha(x) > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

We also denote $\beta_{\min} := 1 - \alpha_{\max} > 0$.

We consider averages of the form

$$\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) := \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(B_\varepsilon^\nu)} \int_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h),$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{n-1}$ denotes the $(n-1)$-dimensional Lebesgue measure. The open ball of radius ε in the $(n-1)$-dimensional hyperplane $\nu^\perp$ orthogonal to $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by B_ε^ν i.e.

$$B_\varepsilon^\nu := B_\varepsilon(0) \cap \nu^\perp := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : |z| < \varepsilon \text{ and } \langle z, \nu\rangle = 0\}.$$

Throughout the paper, we denote open n-dimensional balls of radius $r > 0$ by $B_r(x)$ or by B_r, if the center point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ plays no role.

For brevity, the compact boundary strip of the game domain is denoted by

$$\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon} := \overline{I}_\varepsilon \cup \overline{O}_\varepsilon.$$

Let F be a continuous boundary function $F : \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \to \mathbb{R}$. In addition, we define an auxiliary function

$$W(x,\nu) := W(u;x,\nu) := \alpha(x)u(x+\nu) + \beta(x)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \tag{2.3}$$

and an operator

$$\begin{aligned} T_\varepsilon u(x) := {} & \frac{1-\delta(x)}{2}\left[\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\Big(W(u;x,\nu)\Big) + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\Big(W(u;x,\nu)\Big)\right] \\ & + \delta(x)F(x) \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ and continuous functions $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$. By using this operator, we can identify the solutions to (1.1) with the fixed points of T_ε. Note that, despite the fact that $\alpha(x)$ and $\beta(x)$ are not defined in the outside strip $\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon \setminus \overline{\Omega}$, (2.4) is well-defined by setting $T_\varepsilon u(x) = F(x)$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. Similarly, it turns out that $\delta(x)F(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$.

The same boundary correction as above is also applied in [LPS14, Har16]. Here, this correction is used in order to preserve measurability when iterating the operator. Indeed, in such iterations the measurability can rather easily be lost, see for example [LPS14, Example 2.4]. In addition, an asymptotic expansion close to (1.1) is studied in [KMP12].

2.1 The two-player tug-of-war game

In this subsection, we introduce the stochastic zero-sum tug-of-war game used in this work. Most of the methods of this paper arise from game theory and some of the results are even directly proved by using game theory arguments (for example the uniqueness proof in Theorem 3.6).

Let us consider a game involving two players (say P_{I} and P_{II}). A token is placed at a starting point $x_0 \in \Omega$. Suppose that, after $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ movements, the token is at a point $x_j \in \Omega$. Then,

- if $x_j \in \Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$, P_{I} and P_{II} decide their possible moves ν^{I}_{j+1} and ν^{II}_{j+1}, respectively, with $\left|\nu^{\mathrm{I}}_{j+1}\right| = \left|\nu^{\mathrm{II}}_{j+1}\right| = \varepsilon$. A fair coin is tossed and if P_i wins the toss, we have two possibilities
  - with probability $\alpha(x_j)$, the token is moved to $x_{j+1} = x_j + \nu^i_{j+1}$, and
  - with probability $\beta(x_j)$, the token is moved to a point $x_{j+1} \in x_j + B_\varepsilon^{\nu^i_{j+1}}$ uniformly random

  with $i \in \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}\}$.
- If $x_j \in I_\varepsilon \cup O_\varepsilon$,
  - the game ends with probability $\delta(x_j)$ and then P_{II} pays P_{I} the amount given by $F(x_j)$, and
  - with probability $1 - \delta(x_j)$, the players play a game as in the previous case $x_j \in \Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$.

Let τ denote the time when the game ends, and denote by $x_\tau \in \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ the position where the game ends. Then, P_{II} pays P_{I} the quantity $F(x_\tau)$. We define a *history* of the game as the vector $(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_j)$ describing the positions of the token at each step after j repetitions. A *strategy* is a sequence of Borel measurable functions that give the next game position given the history of the game. Therefore, we define $\mathcal{S}_i := (\mathcal{S}_i^j)_{j=1}^\infty$ with

$$\mathcal{S}_i^j : \{x_0\} \times \bigcup_{k=1}^{j-1} (\Omega_\varepsilon)^k \to \partial B_\varepsilon(0)$$

for all $j \geq 1$ and with both $i \in \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{II}\}$. For example, we have for P_{I} and for all $j \geq 1$ that

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}^j\big((x_0, \ldots, x_{j-1})\big) = \nu^{\mathrm{I}}_j \in \partial B_\varepsilon(0).$$

Given a starting point $x_0 \in \Omega$ and strategies $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}$, we define a probability measure $\mathbb{P}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}}$ on the natural product σ-algebra of the space of all game

trajectories. This measure is built by applying Kolmogorov's extension theorem to the family of transition densities

$$\pi_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{I},\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{II}}\big((x_0,\dots,x_j),A\big) = \frac{1}{2}\Bigg[\alpha(x_j)\Big(\mathbb{I}_{x_j+\nu^\mathrm{I}_{j+1}}(A)+\mathbb{I}_{x_j+\nu^\mathrm{II}_{j+1}}(A)\Big) + \frac{\beta(x_j)}{\omega_{n-1}\varepsilon^{n-1}}\Big(\mathcal{L}^{n-1}\Big(B_\varepsilon^{\nu^\mathrm{I}_{j+1}}(x_j)\cap A\Big)+\mathcal{L}^{n-1}\Big(B_\varepsilon^{\nu^\mathrm{II}_{j+1}}(x_j)\cap A\Big)\Big)\Bigg]$$

for all Borel subsets $A\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ as long as $x_j\in\Omega\setminus I_\varepsilon$ with the constant $\omega_{n-1}:=\mathcal{L}^{n-1}\big(B_1^z\big)$ for any $z\in\mathbb{R}^n$. The function $\mathbb{I}_z(A)$ is one if $z\in A$, and zero otherwise, for all $z\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and $A\subset\mathbb{R}^n$. In addition, we denote $B_\varepsilon^z(y):=y+B_\varepsilon^z$ for $z,y\in\mathbb{R}^n$. If $x_j\in I_\varepsilon$, the transition densities are multiplied with the boundary correction function δ similarly as in the DPP (1.1). If $x_j\notin\Omega$, the transition densities force $x_{j+1}=x_j$.

Here, we follow the ideas from [Har16], where the constant α case is covered. For the benefit of the reader and since the setting is slightly different, we give a self-contained proof.

Lemma 2.1. *The game ends almost surely in finite time, irregardless of the strategies $\mathcal{S}_I$ and $\mathcal{S}_{II}$.*

Proof. The idea of the proof is to consider solely random movements and to find a uniform lower bound for the probability of the event that the modulus of $|x_j|$ grows in a suitable fashion. In the proof, we need the fact $\beta_{\min}>0$.

Let $x_0\in\Omega$, $j\geq 0$ and let $x_{j+1}=x_j+h_j$, where h_j represents the displacement at each step of the game. By the vector calculus, we have

$$|x_{j+1}|^2=|x_j|^2+|h_j|^2+2\langle x_j,h_j\rangle.$$

In addition by the definition of the game, h_j is randomly chosen from B_ε^ν with a probability $\beta(x_j)/2$ for the vector $\nu:=\nu^\mathrm{I}_{j+1}$. Moreover, given that a random movement is chosen from B_ε^ν, we have $\langle x_j,h_j\rangle\geq 0$ with a probability of at least $\frac{1}{2}$ and the event $|h_j|\geq\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ has a probability of

$$1-\frac{\mathcal{L}^{n-1}\big(B^\nu_{\varepsilon/2}\big)}{\mathcal{L}^{n-1}\big(B^\nu_\varepsilon\big)}=1-2^{1-n}.$$

Consequently, there is a positive probability of a random movement h_j such that $|h_j|\geq\varepsilon/2$ and $\langle x_j,h_j\rangle\geq 0$. In this case, we have

$$|x_{j+1}|^2\geq|x_j|^2+\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} \tag{2.5}$$

with a probability of at least

$$\beta(x_j)\left(\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\right)\geq\beta_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\right)=:\theta>0.$$

Note that the universal constant θ does not depend on j and the fact $\beta_{\min} > 0$ implies $\theta > 0$. Now, let

$$j_0 := j_0(\varepsilon, \Omega) = 4\left\lceil \operatorname{diam}(\Omega)\varepsilon^{-2} \right\rceil \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then, after j_0 consecutive movements in the way (2.5) we have

$$|x_{j_0}|^2 \geq |x_0|^2 + j_0\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} > |x_0|^2 + \operatorname{diam}(\Omega).$$

Therefore, the token has exited the game domain after at most j_0 steps for any starting point x_0 with a probability of at least θ^{j_0}. Consequently, the probability of not exiting the game domain after j_0 steps is bounded above by $1 - \theta^{j_0}$.

By repeating kj_0 times the game, the probability of not exiting Ω after kj_0 steps is bounded above by

$$\left(1 - \theta^{j_0}\right)^k.$$

Thus, by letting $k \to \infty$, this probability goes to zero, and the proof is completed. □

For all starting points $x_0 \in \Omega$, we define a *value function* for P_{I} and for P_{II} by

$$\begin{cases} u_{\mathrm{I}}(x_0) = \sup\limits_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}} \inf\limits_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}} \mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}}[F(x_\tau)], \\ \\ u_{\mathrm{II}}(x_0) = \inf\limits_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}} \sup\limits_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}} \mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}}[F(x_\tau)]. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

3 Existence and Uniqueness

In this section, the goal is to prove that there exists a unique continuous solution satisfying the dynamic programming principle (1.1). The proof is divided into two parts. In Section 3.1, by iterating the operator T_ε defined in (2.4), we show that there exist a lower and an upper semicontinuous solution to (1.1). Then in Section 3.2, we show that every measurable solution to (1.1) is bounded between the lower and the upper semicontinuous solutions. In addition, we prove by using the tug-of-war game defined in Section 2.1 that, in fact, both semicontinuous solutions are the same.

3.1 Existence of semicontinuous solutions to (1.1)

In this subsection, by iterating the operator T_ε, we construct monotone sequences of bounded continuous functions. As a consequence, these sequences converge to semicontinuous functions which turn out to be solutions to (1.1). With that purpose, first, we need to show that T_ε maps continuous functions into continuous functions.

Lemma 3.1. *For any continuous function $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$, the function $W(x,\nu)$ defined in (2.3) is continuous with respect to each variable on $\overline{\Omega} \times \partial B_\varepsilon(0)$.*

Proof. For fixed $|\nu| = \varepsilon$, we have for any $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\alpha(x)u(x+\nu) - \alpha(y)u(y+\nu)| \\
&\leq |\alpha(x)u(x+\nu) - \alpha(x)u(y+\nu)| + |\alpha(x)u(y+\nu) - \alpha(y)u(y+\nu)| \\
&\leq \alpha(x)\omega_u(|x-y|) + \|u\|_\infty \omega_\alpha(|x-y|),
\end{aligned}$$

where ω_f is a modulus of continuity of the uniformly continuous function f. In a similar way, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\beta(x)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) - \beta(y)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(y+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right| \\
&\qquad\qquad \leq \beta(x)\omega_u(|x-y|) + \|u\|_\infty \omega_\beta(|x-y|)
\end{aligned}$$

for $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$. Thus, these inequalities imply that

$$|W(x,\nu) - W(y,\nu)| \leq \omega_u(|x-y|) + \|u\|_\infty \left[\omega_\alpha(|x-y|) + \omega_\beta(|x-y|)\right] \quad (3.1)$$

for all $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$. Hence, $W(\cdot,\nu)$ is a continuous function for fixed ν with modulus of continuity $\omega_u + \|u\|_\infty \left[\omega_\alpha + \omega_\beta\right]$.

For the continuity on ν, fix a point $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. Then, the modulus of continuity of α does not play any role. In addition, since the function u is continuous by the hypothesis, we only need to check the continuity of the function

$$\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h).$$

Let $|\nu| = |\chi| = \varepsilon$ and define a rotation $P : \nu^\perp \to \chi^\perp$ satisfying

$$|h - Ph| \leq C\,|h|\,|\nu - \chi| \quad (3.2)$$

for all $h \in \nu^\perp$, where $C > 0$ is a constant not depending on the choices of ν and χ. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) - \fint_{B_\varepsilon^\chi} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \\
&\qquad = \fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} \left[u(x+h) - u(x+Ph)\right] d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h). \quad (3.3)
\end{aligned}$$

By recalling (3.2) together with the fact that we can choose ω_u to be increasing, we can estimate the expression in brackets in the equation (3.3) from above by

$$\omega_u\left(C\varepsilon\,|\nu - \chi|\right)$$

for $h \in B_\varepsilon^\nu$. Then, this same bound also holds for (3.3), and the continuity of $W(x,\cdot)$ for fixed $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ follows. ∎

Lemma 3.2. *For all $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$, the operator T_ε defined in (2.4) satisfies $T_\varepsilon u \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$. In addition, for all $u, v \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$ such that $u \le v$, we have*

$$T_\varepsilon u \le T_\varepsilon v \ (\textit{monotonicity}).$$

Proof. The monotonicity of T_ε follows easily from the definition (2.4). Let $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$ be a function with a modulus of continuity ω_u. By (2.4) and the fact that F is continuous on $\overline{O}_\varepsilon$, the function $T_\varepsilon u$ is continuous on the outside strip $\overline{O}_\varepsilon$. Thus, we have to check that $T_\varepsilon u$ is continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$.

First, let $x, y \in \Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$ and recall the elementary inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(x,\nu) - \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(y,\nu)\right| &\le \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} |W(x,\nu) - W(y,\nu)|\,,\\ \left|\inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(x,\nu) - \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(y,\nu)\right| &\le \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} |W(x,\nu) - W(y,\nu)|\,.\end{aligned}$$

Then by the inequality (3.1) for any $|\nu| = \varepsilon$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\left|\left(\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\right) W(x,\nu) - \left(\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\right) W(y,\nu)\right|\\ &\le \omega_u(|x-y|) + \|u\|_\infty \Big[\omega_\alpha(|x-y|) + \omega_\beta(|x-y|)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Here, we use the shorthand notation

$$\left(\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\right) W(x,\nu) := \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(x,\nu) + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(x,\nu).$$

Therefore, since $\delta = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$, we have shown that $T_\varepsilon u$ is continuous on $\Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$.

Then, let $x, y \in I_\varepsilon$ and recall that $\sup_{x\in\Omega}\big(1-\delta(x)\big) = 1$ and $\omega_\delta(t) = t/\varepsilon$ for $t \ge 0$. Thus, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1-\delta(x)}{2}\left(\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\right) W(x,\nu) - \frac{1-\delta(y)}{2}\left(\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon}\right) W(y,\nu)\right|\\ &\le \omega_u(|x-y|) + \|u\|_\infty \left[\omega_\alpha(|x-y|) + \omega_\beta(|x-y|)\right] + \frac{\|u\|_\infty}{\varepsilon}\,|x-y|\end{aligned}$$

and

$$|\delta(x)F(x) - \delta(y)F(y)| \le \delta(x)\omega_F(|x-y|) + \frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\varepsilon}\,|x-y|\,.$$

Consequently, $T_\varepsilon u$ is continuous in I_ε. Since the limiting values of the function $T_\varepsilon u$ coincide with the function values on the boundary ∂I_ε, there must exist a modulus of continuity for $T_\varepsilon u$, and hence $T_\varepsilon u \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$. ∎

For the next result, let T_ε^k denote the k-th iteration of the operator T_ε for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e.

$$T_\varepsilon^k = T_\varepsilon(T_\varepsilon^{k-1}),\ T_\varepsilon^0 = \mathrm{Id},$$

with the identity operator $\mathrm{Id}(u) = u$ for all $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon)$. By (2.4) and the monotonicity of T_ε, the sequence of iterates $\left\{T_\varepsilon^k(\inf F)\right\}_k$ is increasing and $\left\{T_\varepsilon^k(\sup F)\right\}_k$ is decreasing. Moreover,

$$\inf F \le T_\varepsilon^k(\inf F) \le T_\varepsilon^k(\sup F) \le \sup F \tag{3.4}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, we can define the pointwise limit of both sequences

$$\begin{cases} \underline{u}(x) := \lim\limits_{k\to\infty} T_\varepsilon^k(\inf F), \\ \\ \overline{u}(x) := \lim\limits_{k\to\infty} T_\varepsilon^k(\sup F) \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$. In addition, since $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ are defined as the limit of monotone sequences of continuous functions, they are lower and upper semicontinuous functions, respectively.

Proposition 3.3. *The functions $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ defined in (3.5) are solutions to (1.1) and satisfy*

$$\underline{u} \le \overline{u}. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. The inequality (3.6) follows easily from (3.4). We only show that $\underline{u}$ is a solution to (1.1), since a similar argument can be applied to $\overline{u}$. To establish the result, we use Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 and the fact that $\{T_\varepsilon^k(\inf F)\}$ is increasing to show that we can change the order of the limit and the infimum in the function $\underline{u}$.

Let $x \in \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$ and $u_k := T_\varepsilon^k(\inf F)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{u}(x) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} u_{k+1}(x) \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty} T_\varepsilon u_k(x) \\ &= \frac{1-\delta(x)}{2}\left[\lim_{k\to\infty}\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(u_k;x,\nu) + \lim_{k\to\infty}\inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(u_k;x,\nu)\right] \\ &\quad + \delta(x)F(x), \end{aligned}$$

where W denotes the auxiliary function defined in (2.3). Thus, we need to prove the equalities

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(u_k;x,\nu) = \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(\underline{u};x,\nu)$$

and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(u_k;x,\nu) = \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(\underline{u};x,\nu).$$

The first equation follows from the fact that the sequence $\{u_k\}$ is pointwise increasing. For the second equation, we can assume $x \in \Omega$. Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 imply that $W(u_k; x, \nu)$ is continuous with respect to ν for all $k \geq 1$. Therefore, we can define the compact set

$$C_k(\lambda) := \{\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\nu| = \varepsilon \text{ and } W(u_k; x, \nu) \leq \lambda\}$$

for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Again, since $\{u_k\}$ is pointwise increasing, $C_{k+1}(\lambda) \subset C_k(\lambda)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Now, let

$$\lambda = \lim_{k\to\infty} \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(u_k; x, \nu).$$

Because $W(u_k; x, \cdot)$ is continuous for all $k \geq 1$, there exists $\nu_k^* \in \partial B_\varepsilon(0)$ such that

$$\inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(u_k; x, \nu) = W(u_k; x, \nu_k^*).$$

This together with the fact that $\{u_k\}$ is increasing yield $C_k(\lambda) \neq \emptyset$ for all $k \geq 1$. Thus by Cantor's intersection theorem, we get

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} C_k(\lambda) \neq \emptyset.$$

Choose $\tilde{\nu} \in \cap_{k=1}^{\infty} C_k(\lambda)$ so that we can estimate

$$\lambda \leq \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(\underline{u}; x, \nu) \leq W(\underline{u}; x, \tilde{\nu}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} W(u_k; x, \tilde{\nu}) \leq \lambda.$$

The first inequality follows from the choice of λ and the fact that $\{u_k\}$ is increasing. In addition, we use the monotone convergence theorem in the first equality and the choice of $\tilde{\nu}$ in the last inequality. Therefore, the proof is complete. □

3.2 Uniqueness of solutions to (1.1)

In this subsection, we prove the uniqueness of solutions to (1.1). To establish the result, we first show that any measurable solution of the equation (1.1) is between the solutions $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$. Then, we show that, in fact, the functions $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ coincide. For the first result, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let u be a measurable solution to (1.1). Assume that $\sup F < \sup_\Omega u$, and let $x \in \Omega$ be such that*

$$u(x) > \max\left\{\sup F, \sup_\Omega u - \lambda\right\} \tag{3.7}$$

for $\lambda > 0$. Then, there exist $|\nu_0| = \varepsilon$ and $h_0 \in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}$ satisfying the inequalities

$$|x + h_0|^2 \geq |x|^2 + 2^{\frac{2}{1-n}}\varepsilon^2 \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$u(x+h_0) \geq \sup_{\Omega} u - c(\alpha)\lambda \tag{3.9}$$

with a constant $c(\alpha) > 1$.

Proof. We obtain the inequalities (3.8) and (3.9) by analyzing the dynamic programming principle (1.1). The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.1. Since u satisfies (1.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &\leq (1-\delta(x)) \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} \left(\alpha(x) u(x+\nu) + \beta(x) \fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \right) \\ &\quad + \delta(x) \sup F \\ &\leq (1-\delta(x))\alpha(x) \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} u(x+\nu) \\ &\quad + (1-\delta(x))\beta(x) \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} \fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \\ &\quad + \delta(x) \sup F. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by utilizing the assumption (3.7) and $u = F$ on $\overline{O}_\varepsilon$, we get

$$\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} u(x+\nu) \leq u(x) + \lambda.$$

Thus by (3.7), $0 < \delta(x) < 1$, $\alpha(x) + \beta(x) = 1$ and $\beta(x) \geq \beta_{\min} > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$u(x) \leq \sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} \fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) + \frac{\alpha_{\max}}{\beta_{\min}} \lambda.$$

By the definition of supremum, there must exist $|\nu_0| = \varepsilon$ such that

$$u(x) - 2\frac{\alpha_{\max}}{\beta_{\min}} \lambda \leq \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}} u(x+h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h). \tag{3.10}$$

Next, we define a set $S \subset B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}$ depending on x and ν_0. If $x \neq 0$ and $\nu_0 \in \operatorname{span}\{x\}$ or $x = 0$, we define

$$S := \left\{ h \in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0} \ : \ |h| \geq (3/4)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Otherwise, we set

$$S := \left\{ h \in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0} \ : \ |h| \geq 2^{\frac{1}{1-n}} \varepsilon \text{ and } \langle x, h \rangle \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Observe that in both the cases the Lebesgue measure of the set S is the same. Indeed, it is clear that

$$\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}) - \mathcal{L}^{n-1}(B^{\nu_0}_{(3/4)^{1/(n-1)}\varepsilon}) = \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{L}^{n-1}(B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}).$$

By symmetry, we get

$$\mathcal{L}^{n-1}\big(\{h \in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0} : \langle x, h\rangle > 0\}\big) = \mathcal{L}^{n-1}\big(\{h \in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0} : \langle x, h\rangle < 0\}\big),$$

and in the case $x \neq 0$ and $\nu_0 \notin \operatorname{span}\{x\}$, it holds

$$\mathcal{L}^{n-1}\big(\{h \in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0} : \langle x, h\rangle = 0\}\big) = 0.$$

Thus, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(S) = \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}). \tag{3.11}$$

In addition, because $(3/4)^{\frac{2}{n-1}} \geq 2^{\frac{2}{1-n}}$, the inequality (3.8) holds for each $h \in S$. The equality (3.11) together with (3.7) and (3.10) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_\Omega u &\leq u(x) + \lambda \\
&\leq \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) + \lambda\frac{1+\alpha_{\max}}{\beta_{\min}} \\
&= \frac{1}{4\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(S)}\left\{\int_S u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) + \int_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}\setminus S} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right\} \\
&\quad + \lambda\frac{1+\alpha_{\max}}{\beta_{\min}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4}\fint_S u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) + \frac{3}{4}\sup_\Omega u + \frac{2\lambda}{\beta_{\min}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By rearranging the terms and multiplying by 4, we have

$$\sup_\Omega u - \frac{8\lambda}{\beta_{\min}} \leq \fint_S u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h).$$

Hence, there must exist $h_0 \in S \subset B_\varepsilon^{\nu_0}$ satisfying (3.9). □

Proposition 3.5. *Any measurable solution u to (1.1) satisfies*

$$\underline{u} \leq u \leq \overline{u}$$

with $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ the semicontinuous functions defined in (3.5).

Proof. By the monotonicity of the operator T_ε and the definitions of $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$, it is enough to show that

$$\inf F \leq u \leq \sup F. \tag{3.12}$$

Because u is a solution to (1.1), we have $u(x) = F(x)$ for $x \in \overline{O}_\varepsilon$. Hence, we need to show the estimate (3.12) for all $x \in \Omega$. We focus our attention

on the second inequality, since the proof of the first inequality is analogous. We proceed by contradiction and assume that

$$\sup_{\Omega} u > \sup F.$$

By the assumption, for $\eta > 0$ there exists a point $x_1 \in \Omega$ such that

$$u(x_1) > \max\left\{\sup F, \sup_{\Omega} u - \eta\right\}.$$

The idea of the proof consists of finding a sequence of points $\{x_j\}$ satisfying $u(x_j) > \sup F$ for all j and $|x_{j_0}|$ is big enough for some large $j_0 \geq 1$. This is a contradiction, because $u = F$ on $\overline{O}_\varepsilon$. We obtain the sequence of points by using Lemma 3.4 iteratively.

Choose an integer $j_0 := j_0(\varepsilon, n, \Omega) \geq 1$ big enough such that

$$j 2^{\frac{2}{1-n}} \varepsilon^2 > \operatorname{diam}(\Omega) \tag{3.13}$$

for all $j \geq j_0$. Then, we fix the constant $\eta > 0$ small enough such that

$$0 < \eta < \frac{1}{c(\alpha)^{j_0}} \left(\sup_{\Omega} u - \sup F\right) \tag{3.14}$$

with the constant $c(\alpha) > 1$ from Lemma 3.4. We start from x_1 and choose x_2 such that $x_2 = x_1 + h_0$ with h_0 given by Lemma 3.4. Then, we have that $|x_2|^2 \geq |x_1|^2 + 2^{\frac{2}{1-n}} \varepsilon^2$ and

$$u(x_2) \geq \sup_{\Omega} u - c(\alpha)\eta > \sup F.$$

If $x_2 \in \overline{O}_\varepsilon$, we get a contradiction. Otherwise, we continue in the same way. We choose x_3 such that $x_3 = x_2 + h_1$ with h_1 given by Lemma 3.4. Then, we have that $|x_3|^2 \geq |x_1|^2 + 2 \cdot 2^{\frac{2}{1-n}} \varepsilon^2$ and

$$u(x_3) \geq \sup_{\Omega} u - c(\alpha)^2 \eta > \sup F.$$

After $j_0 - 1$ repetitions, assume that $x_{j_0} \in \Omega$. By the inequalities (3.13) and (3.14) it holds for the point x_{j_0+1} that

$$|x_{j_0+1}|^2 \geq |x_1|^2 + j_0 2^{\frac{2}{1-n}} \varepsilon^2 > |x_1|^2 + \operatorname{diam}(\Omega)$$

and

$$u(x_{j_0+1}) \geq \sup_{\Omega} u - c(\alpha)^{j_0} \eta > \sup F.$$

Since $x_{j_0+1} \notin \Omega$, the contradiction follows. □

The next theorem together with (3.6) imply that the semicontinuous solutions to (1.1), $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$, coincide.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ be the semicontinuous functions defined in (3.5). In addition, let u_I and u_{II} be the value functions defined in (2.6). Then, we have that*

$$\overline{u} \leq u_I \leq u_{II} \leq \underline{u}.$$

Proof. To establish the result, we show that under a suitable strategy for the other player, the process $\underline{u}(x_k)$ becomes a supermartingale and the process $\overline{u}(x_k)$ becomes a submartingale irregardless what the opponent does. Then, we are able to compare the functions $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ with the value functions of the game.

From the properties of inf and sup, it is clear that

$$u_{\mathrm{I}} \leq u_{\mathrm{II}}.$$

Thus, we need to prove that

$$u_{\mathrm{II}} \leq \underline{u} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u} \leq u_{\mathrm{I}}.$$

We only show $u_{\mathrm{II}} \leq \underline{u}$, since the argument in the other case is similar. Let $x_0 \in \Omega$ and denote a strategy $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}^*$ for P_{II} such that

$$W(\underline{u}; x_j, \nu_j^{\mathrm{II}}) = \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(\underline{u}; x_j, \nu)$$

for all $j \geq 0$, where W denotes the auxiliary function defined in (2.3). By a measure theoretical analysis, we can prove that this strategy is Borel measurable (for more details, see for example [Sri98, Theorem 5.3.1]).

Fix any strategy $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}$ for P_{I}. Now, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}^*}[\underline{u}(x_{j+1})|x_0,\dots,x_j] \\
&= \frac{1-\delta(x_j)}{2}\left[W(\underline{u}; x_j, \nu_{j+1}^{\mathrm{I}}) + W(\underline{u}; x_j, \nu_{j+1}^{\mathrm{II}})\right] + \delta(x_j)F(x_j) \\
&\leq \frac{1-\delta(x_j)}{2}\left[\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(\underline{u}; x_j, \nu) + \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(\underline{u}; x_j, \nu)\right] + \delta(x_j)F(x_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\underline{u}$ is a solution to (1.1), we have by the estimate above

$$\mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}^*}[\underline{u}(x_{j+1})|x_0,\dots,x_j] \leq \underline{u}(x_j)$$

for all $j \geq 0$. Thus, the stochastic process $M_k := \underline{u}(x_k)$ is a supermartingale, when P_{II} uses the strategy $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}^*$. By Lemma 2.1, the game ends almost surely, and since F is bounded, we get by using the optional stopping theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{\mathrm{II}}(x_0) &= \inf_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}} \sup_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}} \mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}}[F(x_\tau)] \\
&\leq \sup_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}} \mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{II}}^*}[F(x_\tau)] \\
&\leq \underline{u}(x_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the proof is finished. ∎

Now, Theorem 3.6 and 3.5 imply the uniqueness of solutions to (1.1). In addition, this unique function is continuous and the value function of the game.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $F : \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous function. Then, there exists a continuous function $u_\varepsilon : \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with the boundary data F such that it satisfies the dynamic programming principle (1.1). Moreover, this function is unique, and it is the value function of the game, i.e. $u_\varepsilon = u_I = u_{II}$ with u_I and u_{II} defined in (2.6).*

4 Local Regularity

In this section, we give a local regularity estimate for functions satisfying (1.1) in $\Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$. The dynamic programming principle in $\Omega \setminus I_\varepsilon$ reduces to the equation

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) = \frac{1}{2}\Bigg[&\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} \left(\alpha(x)u(x+\nu) + \beta(x) \fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \right) \\ &+ \inf_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} \left(\alpha(x)u(x+\nu) + \beta(x) \fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} u(x+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \right) \Bigg]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

The regularity result is based on a method established by Luiro and Parviainen in [LP]. The method consists of several steps: First, we choose a comparison function f having the desired regularity properties. Then, the idea is to analyze two different cases separately. At a small scale, we need to control the jumps of the function satisfying (4.1). At a bigger scale, the key term of the comparison function is $C|x-z|^\gamma$ with $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n, 0 < \gamma < 1$ and $C > 0$ big enough.

In the second step, we aim to prove that the error $u(x) - u(z) - f(x,z)$, where u is the solution to (4.1), is smaller in $(B_1 \times B_1) \setminus T$ than in $(B_2 \times B_2) \setminus (B_1 \times B_1 \setminus T)$ with both sets belonging to $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. The set T is the set of points $(x,z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ such that $x = z$. Then, we thrive for a contradiction by assuming that the error is bigger in $(B_1 \times B_1) \setminus T$.

As a final step, we get a contradiction by using a multidimensional dynamic programming principle for the comparison function f. In the proof below, intuition based on suitable strategies is helpful even though we do not write down stochastic arguments. We can pull the points $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ closer to each other in terms of the expected distance defined under a relevant strategy for the comparison function. If the almost optimal move of the opponent is close enough to a direction, the player cancels that move. This is enough in the estimates below, because the term $C|x-z|^\gamma$ in the comparison function bends nicely. If the almost optimal move of the opponent is not close to the direction, the player takes an advantage by moving

the game position towards a target set. In this case, the first order terms of the comparison function imply the result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let* $(x,z) \in B_R \times B_R$, $B_{2R} \subset \Omega$ *and*

$$0 < \gamma < \frac{\alpha_{min}}{\alpha_{max}} - \kappa \tag{4.2}$$

for arbitrary small $\kappa \in \left(0, \alpha_{min}/\alpha_{max}\right)$ *with* $\alpha_{min}, \alpha_{max}$ *defined in* (2.2). *Then, if* u *satisfies* (4.1), *we have*

$$|u(x) - u(z)| \leq C\frac{|x-z|^\gamma}{R^\gamma} + C\frac{\varepsilon^\gamma}{R^\gamma} \tag{4.3}$$

with $C := C(p_{min}, p_{max}, n, R, \sup_{B_{2R}} u, \gamma)$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ *and* p_{min}, p_{max} *defined in* (2.1).

Proof. By using a scaling $x \mapsto Rx$, we can assume that $R = 1$. In addition by translation, it is enough to prove the estimate (4.3) with $z = -x$. For simplicity, we assume $\sup_{B_2 \times B_2}(u(x) - u(z)) \leq 1$.

Given $C > 1$, let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that

$$N \geq \frac{10^2 C}{\gamma}.$$

Then, we define the following functions in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$

$$f_1(x,z) = C\,|x-z|^\gamma + |x+z|^2\,,$$

$$f_2(x,z) = \begin{cases} C^{2(N-i)}\varepsilon^\gamma & \text{if } (x,z) \in A_i, \\ 0 & \text{if } |x-z| > N\dfrac{\varepsilon}{10}, \end{cases}$$

$$f(x,z) = f_1(x,z) - f_2(x,z)$$

with $A_i = \left\{(x,z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \,:\, (i-1)\dfrac{\varepsilon}{10} < |x-z| \leq i\dfrac{\varepsilon}{10}\right\}$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, N$. The function f_2 is called an *annular step function*, and it is needed to control the small scale jumps. Note that we have $\sup f_2 = C^{2N}\varepsilon^\gamma$ reached on

$$T := A_0 = \left\{(x,z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \,:\, x = z\right\}.$$

It holds that $f_1 \geq 1$ in $(B_2 \times B_2) \setminus (B_1 \times B_1)$. Here, we need the term $|x+z|^2$ in the function f_1, because

$$|x+z|^2 = 2|x|^2 + 2|z|^2 - |x-z|^2 \geq 3$$

for all $x, z \in (B_2 \times B_2) \setminus (B_1 \times B_1)$ such that $|x-z| \leq 1$. Therefore, together with $u(x) - u(z) \leq 1$ in $B_2 \times B_2$ and $u(x) - u(z) = 0$ in T we have

$$u(x) - u(z) - f(x,z) \leq \sup f_2 = C^{2N}\varepsilon^\gamma, \tag{4.4}$$

if $(x,z) \in T$ or $(x,z) \in (B_2 \times B_2) \setminus (B_1 \times B_1)$. We have to show that this inequality is also true in $(B_1 \times B_1) \setminus T$. Thriving for a contradiction, write

$$M := \sup_{(x,z)\in B_1\times B_1\setminus T} (u(x) - u(z) - f(x,z))$$

and suppose that

$$M > C^{2N}\varepsilon^{\gamma}.$$

By (4.4), this is equivalent to

$$M = \sup_{(x,z)\in B_2\times B_2} (u(x) - u(z) - f(x,z)). \tag{4.5}$$

For all $\eta > 0$, we choose a pair of points $(x,z) \in (B_1 \times B_1) \setminus T$ such that

$$M \le u(x) - u(z) - f(x,z) + \frac{\eta}{2}. \tag{4.6}$$

Then by (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) - u(z) \le \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\nu_x,\nu_z} (W(x,\nu_x) - W(z,\nu_z)) \\ + \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\nu_x,\nu_z} (W(x,\nu_x) - W(z,\nu_z)), \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where W is the auxiliary function defined in (2.3).

Given $|\nu_x| = |\nu_z| = \varepsilon$, let $P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}$ denote any rotation that sends ν_z to $-\nu_x$. By recalling $\alpha(x)+\beta(x) = 1$ for $x \in \Omega$, we can decompose the difference $W(x,\nu_x)-W(z,\nu_z)$. For simplicity, we may assume that $\alpha(x) \ge \alpha(z)$. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &W(x,\nu_x) - W(z,\nu_z) \\ &= \alpha(z)\left[u(x+\nu_x) - u(z+\nu_z)\right] \\ &\quad + \beta(x) \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}} \left[u(x + P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h) - u(z+h)\right] d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \\ &\quad + (\alpha(x) - \alpha(z)) \left[u(x+\nu_x) - \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}} u(z+h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Next, we use the counter assumption (4.5) to estimate each of the terms in (4.8) from above. Consequently, we can estimate

$$u(y) - u(\tilde{y}) \le M + f(y,\tilde{y})$$

for all $y, \tilde{y} \in B_2$. Then, we define

$$\begin{aligned} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) := \alpha(z) f(x+\nu_x, z+\nu_z) \\ + \beta(x) \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}} f(x + P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h, z+h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \\ + (\alpha(x) - \alpha(z)) \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}} f(x+\nu_x, z+h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h). \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Thus, we have

$$W(x,\nu_x) - W(z,\nu_z) \le M + G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z). \tag{4.10}$$

By taking the supremum, we obtain

$$\sup_{\nu_x,\nu_z} (W(x,\nu_x) - W(z,\nu_z)) \le M + \sup_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z). \tag{4.11}$$

On the other hand, choose $|\varrho_x| = |\varrho_z| = \varepsilon$ such that

$$\inf_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) \ge G(f,x,z,\varrho_x,\varrho_z) - \eta.$$

This together with (4.10) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\nu_x,\nu_z} (W(x,\nu_x) - W(z,\nu_z)) &\le W(x,\varrho_x) - W(z,\varrho_z) \\ &\le M + G(f,x,z,\varrho_x,\varrho_z) \\ &\le M + \inf_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by applying this inequality and (4.11) to (4.7) we get

$$u(x) - u(z) \le M + \frac{1}{2}\left[\sup_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + \inf_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z)\right] + \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

Combining this with (4.6), we need to show

$$\sup_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + \inf_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) < 2f(x,z).$$

This inequality follows from 4.2 below. Consequently, the equation (4.4) holds in $B_2 \times B_2$.

□

Proposition 4.2. *Let G be as in (4.9) with $x, z \in B_1 \times B_1 \setminus T$ and with the function f and the set T defined as at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 4.1. Then, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + \inf_{\nu_x,\nu_z} G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) < 2f(x,z).$$

The main part of the section is to show this estimate for G. This is done in several steps below.

4.1 Proof of 4.2

Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the space spanned by $x - z \neq 0$. We denote the orthogonal complement of V by $V^\perp$ i.e.

$$V^\perp = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ \langle y, x - z\rangle = 0\}.$$

Given any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can decompose $y = y_V(x-z)/|x-z| + y_{V^\perp}$, where $y_V \in \mathbb{R}$ is the scalar projection of y onto V and $y_{V^\perp} \in V^\perp$, respectively. For the decomposed point it holds

$$y_V = \langle y, \frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\rangle,$$

$$|y_{V^\perp}| = \sqrt{|y|^2 - y_V^2}.$$

By using this notation, the second order Taylor's expansion of f_1 is

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1(x + h_x, z + h_z) - f_1(x, z) \\ & = C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\,(h_x - h_z)_V + 2\langle x + z, h_x + h_z\rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2}C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\left\{(\gamma-1)(h_x-h_z)_V^2 + |(h_x-h_z)_{V^\perp}|^2\right\} \\ & \quad + |h_x + h_z|^2 + \mathcal{E}_{x,z}(h_x, h_z), \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_{x,z}(h_x, h_z)$ is the error term. In the above, we used the calculations

$$\langle \nabla f_1(x,z), (h_x^T, h_z^T)\rangle = C\gamma|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\langle x - z, h_x - h_z\rangle + 2\langle x + z, h_x + h_z\rangle$$

and

$$D^2 f_1 = \begin{bmatrix} A & -A \\ -A & A \end{bmatrix} + 2\begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{I} \\ \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{I} \end{bmatrix}$$

with

$$A := C\gamma|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\left[(\gamma-2)\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\otimes\frac{x-z}{|x-z|} + \mathrm{I}\right].$$

The matrix I stands for the $n \times n$ identity matrix, and we denote the tensor product of two vectors by $\otimes$, i.e. $h \otimes s := hs^T$ for vectors $h, s \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By recalling the elementary formula $h^T(s \otimes s)h = \langle h, s\rangle^2$ for all $h, s \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we get (4.12).

By Taylor's theorem, the error term satisfies

$$|\mathcal{E}_{x,z}(h_x, h_z)| \leq C\left|(h_x^T, h_z^T)\right|^3 (|x-z| - 2\varepsilon)^{\gamma-3},$$

if $|x-z| > 2\varepsilon$. With the choice $N \geq \frac{100C}{\gamma}$ and if $|x-z| > \frac{N}{10}\varepsilon$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{E}_{x,z}(h_x,h_z)| &\leq C(2\varepsilon)^3 \left(\frac{|x-z|}{2}\right)^{\gamma-3} \\ &\leq 64C\varepsilon^2|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\frac{\varepsilon}{|x-z|} \\ &\leq 10\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2, \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

because $|h_x|, |h_z| \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, to prove the result, we distinguish two separate cases. In the first case, we have $|x-z| \leq \frac{N}{10}\varepsilon$ and in the second case, we have $|x-z| > \frac{N}{10}\varepsilon$.

Proof of 4.2: Case $|x-z| \leq N\frac{\varepsilon}{10}$

In this case, we do not utilize the formula (4.12). We use concavity and convexity estimates for the terms in f_1 and the properties of the annular step function f_2. For $x, z \in B_1$ and $|h_x|, |h_z| < \varepsilon < 1$, it holds

$$|f_1(x+h_x, z+h_z) - f_1(x,z)| \leq 2C\varepsilon^\gamma + 16\varepsilon \leq 3C\varepsilon^\gamma$$

for $C > 16$. Consequently by (4.9), we have

$$\sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f_1,x,z,h_x,h_z) \leq f_1(x,z) + 3C\varepsilon^\gamma.$$

Together with $f_2 \geq 0$, these estimates yield

$$\sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f,x,z,h_x,h_z) \leq f_1(x,z) + 3C\varepsilon^\gamma. \tag{4.14}$$

Find $i \in \{1,2,\dots,N\}$ such that $(i-1)\frac{\varepsilon}{10} < |x-z| \leq i\frac{\varepsilon}{10}$ and choose $|\nu_x|, |\nu_z| < \varepsilon$ such that $(x+\nu_x, z+\nu_z) \in A_{i-1}$. Then for $C > 1$ large enough, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f_2,x,z,h_x,h_z) &\geq G(f_2,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) \\ &\geq \alpha(z) f_2(x+\nu_x, z+\nu_z) \\ &= \alpha(z) C^{2(N-i+1)}\varepsilon^\gamma \\ &= \alpha(z)\left(C^2 - \frac{2}{\alpha(z)}\right) C^{2(N-i)}\varepsilon^\gamma + 2f_2(x,z) \\ &> 6C\varepsilon^\gamma + 2f_2(x,z), \end{aligned}$$

where we use $f_2 \geq 0$ in the second inequality and $\alpha(z) > \alpha_{\min} > 0$ for all $z \in \Omega$ in the last inequality. Therefore, by $f = f_1 - f_2$ and (4.14) it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{h_x,h_z} G(f,x,z,h_x,h_z) &\leq \sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f_1,x,z,h_x,h_z) - \sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f_2,x,z,h_x,h_z)) \\ &\leq f_1(x,z) - 2f_2(x,z) - 3C\varepsilon^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequality with (4.14), we get

$$\sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f,x,z,h_x,h_z) + \inf_{h_x,h_z} G(f,x,z,h_x,h_z) < 2f(x,z).$$

Hence, the proof of the case is complete.

Proof of 4.2: Case $|x-z| > N\frac{\varepsilon}{10}$

In this case, $f_2(x,z) = 0$ and hence $f \equiv f_1$. We apply (4.12) to get the result. For $\eta > 0$, let ν_x, ν_z be such that

$$\sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f,x,z,h_x,h_z) \le G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + \eta.$$

Therefore for any $|\varrho_x|, |\varrho_z| \le \varepsilon$, we get the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{h_x,h_z} G(f,x,z,h_x,h_z) + \inf_{h_x,h_z} G(f,x,z,h_x,h_z) \\ &\le G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + G(f,x,z,\varrho_x,\varrho_z) + \eta. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

By (4.13) and $|h_x|, |h_z| \le \varepsilon$, the last two terms in (4.12) are bounded above by

$$(4 + 10\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2})\varepsilon^2.$$

We denote

$$E := E(f,x,z,\gamma,\varepsilon) := f(x,z) + (4 + 10\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2})\varepsilon^2,$$

and recall the notation $P_{h,s}$ denoting the rotation sending h to s for any vectors $|h| = |s|$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By (4.15) and (4.9), it suffices to study

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{[I]} &:= G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + G(f,x,z,\varrho_x,\varrho_z) - 2E \\ &= \alpha(z)\left[f(x+\nu_x, z+\nu_z) + f(x+\varrho_x, z+\varrho_z) - 2E\right] \\ &\quad + \beta(x)\left[\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}} f(x + P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h, z+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\varrho_z}} f(x + P_{\varrho_z,-\varrho_x}h, z+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) - 2E\right] \\ &\quad + (\alpha(x) - \alpha(z))\left[\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}} f(x+\nu_x, z+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\varrho_z}} f(x+\varrho_x, z+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) - 2E\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

For simplicity, we decompose the previous expression into three terms to be examined separately, i.e.

$$\mathbf{[I]} = \alpha(z)\mathbf{[II]} + \beta(x)\mathbf{[III]} + (\alpha(x) - \alpha(z))\mathbf{[IV]}. \tag{4.17}$$

Then by (4.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\textbf{[II]} \le\ & C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\,[(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V+(\varrho_x-\varrho_z)_V]\\ &+2\langle x+z,(\nu_x+\nu_z)+(\varrho_x+\varrho_z)\rangle\\ &+\frac{1}{2}C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\Big\{(\gamma-1)\left[(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V^2+(\varrho_x-\varrho_z)_V^2\right]\\ &\qquad+\left[|(\nu_x-\nu_z)_{V^\perp}|^2+|(\varrho_x-\varrho_z)_{V^\perp}|^2\right]\Big\}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.18}$$

Note that the first order terms in **[III]** vanishes when we integrate over the ball. Therefore, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\textbf{[III]} \le\ & \frac{1}{2}C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\cdot\\ &\cdot\Big\{\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}}\left[(\gamma-1)(h-P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h)_V^2+|(h-P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h)_{V^\perp}|^2\right]d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\\ &+\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\varrho_z}}\left[(\gamma-1)(h-P_{\varrho_z,-\varrho_x}h)_V^2+|(h-P_{\varrho_z,-\varrho_x}h)_{V^\perp}|^2\right]d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\Big\}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

In addition, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\textbf{[IV]} \le\ & C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\,(\nu_x+\varrho_x)_V+2\langle x+z,\nu_x+\varrho_x\rangle\\ &+\frac{1}{2}C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\cdot\\ &\cdot\Big\{\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}}\left[(\gamma-1)(\nu_x-h)_V^2+|(\nu_x-h)_{V^\perp}|^2\right]d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\\ &+\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\varrho_z}}\left[(\gamma-1)(\varrho_x-h)_V^2+|(\varrho_x-h)_{V^\perp}|^2\right]d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\Big\}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

We distinguish between two cases depending on the value of $(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V^2$ and fix $\tau_0<\tau<1$ with $0<\tau_0<1$ defined later. Observe that the case $(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V\ge(\tau+1)\varepsilon$ in **a**) below is actually favorable to us, but we do not need to take an advantage in that case, because the comparison function bends to the right direction.

a) Case $|(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V|\ge(\tau+1)\varepsilon$: In this case, we choose $\varrho_x=-\nu_x$ and $\varrho_z=-\nu_z$. By replacing these vectors in the inequalities **[II]**, **[III]** and **[IV]**

and using symmetry, we obtain

$$[\mathbf{II}] \leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\left[(\gamma-1)(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V^2+|(\nu_x-\nu_z)_{V^\perp}|^2\right],$$

$$[\mathbf{III}] \leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}}|(h-P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h)_{V^\perp}|^2\,d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h),$$

$$[\mathbf{IV}] \leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\left[(\gamma-1)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}}(\nu_x-h)_V^2 d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) + \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}}|(\nu_x-h)_{V^\perp}|^2\,d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right].$$

We used $\gamma-1<0$ and the choice $P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}=P_{-\nu_z,\nu_x}$ in the estimate for **[III]**. By assumption, it holds $(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V^2\geq(\tau+1)^2\varepsilon^2$ implying

$$|(\nu_x-\nu_z)_{V^\perp}|^2\leq\left[4-(\tau+1)^2\right]\varepsilon^2.$$

Thus, we need to obtain uniform bounds for $(\nu_x-h)_V^2$, $|(\nu_x-h)_{V^\perp}|^2$ and $|(h-P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h)_{V^\perp}|^2$ for $h\in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}$.

The assumption $|(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V|\geq(\tau+1)\varepsilon$ together with $|\nu_x|,|\nu_z|\leq\varepsilon$ and Pythagoras' theorem imply

$$\begin{cases}\tau\varepsilon\leq|(\nu_x)_V|\leq\varepsilon, & 0\leq|(\nu_x)_{V^\perp}|\leq\sqrt{1-\tau^2}\,\varepsilon,\\ \tau\varepsilon\leq|(\nu_z)_V|\leq\varepsilon, & 0\leq|(\nu_z)_{V^\perp}|\leq\sqrt{1-\tau^2}\,\varepsilon.\end{cases}\tag{4.21}$$

Moreover, the same facts yield

$$|(\nu_x+\nu_z)_V|\leq(1-\tau)\varepsilon\quad\text{ and }\quad|(\nu_x+\nu_z)_{V^\perp}|\leq2\sqrt{1-\tau^2}\,\varepsilon.$$

By combining these and using Pythagoras' theorem, we get

$$|\nu_x+\nu_z|<\sqrt{8}\,\sqrt{1-\tau}\,\varepsilon,\tag{4.22}$$

since $\tau<1$. Let $h\in B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}$. Then, we have

$$0=\langle h,\nu_z\rangle=h_V(\nu_z)_V+\langle h_{V^\perp},(\nu_z)_{V^\perp}\rangle$$

implying

$$h_V=-\frac{\langle h_{V^\perp},(\nu_z)_{V^\perp}\rangle}{(\nu_z)_V}.$$

In addition by applying this equality together with (4.21) and $|h_{V^\perp}|\leq|h|\leq\varepsilon$, we obtain

$$|h_V|\leq\frac{\varepsilon}{\tau}\sqrt{1-\tau^2}.$$

Consequently, we get the estimates

$$(\nu_x - h)_V \geq \left(\tau - \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\tau}\right)\varepsilon \tag{4.23}$$

and

$$|(\nu_x - h)_{V^\perp}| \leq |(\nu_x)_{V^\perp}| + |h_{V^\perp}| \leq \left(1 + \sqrt{1-\tau^2}\right)\varepsilon. \tag{4.24}$$

We can assume that τ_0 is close enough to 1 guaranteeing the positivity of the quantity $\tau - \tau^{-1}\sqrt{1-\tau^2}$. In order to obtain the last estimate needed, we recall that $P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}$ is any rotation sending the vector ν_z to $-\nu_x$. In particular, we choose a rotation satisfying

$$|h - P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h| \leq |\nu_z - P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}\nu_z| = |\nu_z + \nu_x|$$

for every $|h| \leq \varepsilon$. Hence by recalling (4.22), we get

$$|(h - P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h)_{V^\perp}|^2 \leq 8(1-\tau)\varepsilon^2. \tag{4.25}$$

By replacing the estimates (4.23), (4.24) and (4.25) in **[II]**, **[III]** and **[IV]**, we can calculate

$$\textbf{[II]} \leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2\left[(\gamma-1)(\tau+1)^2 + 4 - (\tau+1)^2\right],$$

$$\textbf{[III]} \leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2\left[8(1-\tau)\right],$$

$$\textbf{[IV]} \leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2\left[(\gamma-1)\left(\tau - \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\tau}\right)^2 + \left(1+\sqrt{1-\tau^2}\right)^2\right].$$

In addition by (4.17), we get

$$\textbf{[I]} \leq \textbf{[V]} \cdot C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2,$$

where **[V]** is equal to

$$(\gamma-1)\left[\alpha(z)(\tau+1)^2 + (\alpha(x)-\alpha(z))\left(\tau - \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau^2}}{\tau}\right)^2\right]$$
$$+ (\alpha(x)-\alpha(z))(1+\sqrt{1-\tau^2}\,)^2 + \alpha(z)\left[(4-(\tau+1)^2)\right] + \beta(x)\;8(1-\tau).$$

The assumption on γ in (4.2) implies that we can choose $\tau_0 := \tau_0(\kappa) < 1$ close enough to 1 such that the previous expression is negative i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\textbf{[V]} &< (\gamma-1)\big(4\alpha(z) + \alpha(x) - \alpha(z)\big) + \alpha(x) - \alpha(z) + \kappa\alpha_{\max}\\ &< 4\big(\gamma\alpha_{\max} - \alpha_{\min}\big) + \kappa\alpha_{\max}\\ &< 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now, by recalling (4.16), we have

$$G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z)+G(f,x,z,\omega_x,\omega_z)-2f(x,z)\\ \leq 8\varepsilon^2+(20+[\mathbf{V}]\cdot C\gamma)\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2.$$

By choosing $C>1$ large enough, we obtain

$$(20+[\mathbf{V}]\cdot C\gamma)\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2<-10^8\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2<-10^7\varepsilon^2.$$

This estimate yields

$$G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z)+G(f,x,z,\omega_x,\omega_z)-2f(x,z)<0.$$

b) Case $|(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V|\leq(\tau+1)\varepsilon$**:** In this case, the first order terms in (4.12) imply the result. By choosing $\varrho_x=-\varepsilon\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}$ and $\varrho_z=\varepsilon\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}$ in V and utilizing these in (4.18), (4.19) and (4.20), we get

$$[\mathbf{II}]\leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\,[(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V-2\varepsilon]+2\langle x+z,\nu_x+\nu_z\rangle\\ +\frac{1}{2}C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\left\{(\gamma-1)\left[(\nu_x-\nu_z)_V^2+4\varepsilon^2\right]+|(\nu_x-\nu_z)_{V^\perp}|^2\right\},$$

$$[\mathbf{III}]\leq\frac{1}{2}C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\cdot\\ \cdot\left\{\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}}\left[(\gamma-1)(h-P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h)_V^2+|(h-P_{\nu_z,-\nu_x}h)_{V^\perp}|^2\right]d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right\}$$

and

$$[\mathbf{IV}]\leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\,[(\nu_x)_V-\varepsilon]+2\langle x+z,\nu_x-\varepsilon\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\rangle\\ +\frac{1}{2}C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\cdot\\ \cdot\left\{\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_z}}\left[(\gamma-1)(\nu_x-h)_V^2+|(\nu_x-h)_{V^\perp}|^2\right]d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right.\\ \left.+(\gamma-1)\varepsilon^2+\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{x-z}}|h|^2\,d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right\}.$$

The second order terms in these inequalities can be estimated above by

$$3C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2.$$

In addition, we deduce that $(\nu_x - \nu_z)_V < \left[1 + \left(\frac{\tau+1}{2}\right)^2\right]\varepsilon$. Therefore, we have

$$[\mathbf{II}] \leq C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\left[\left(\frac{\tau+1}{2}\right)^2 - 1\right]\varepsilon + 4\,|x+z|\,\varepsilon + 3C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2,$$

$$[\mathbf{III}] \leq 3C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2,$$

$$[\mathbf{IV}] \leq 4\,|x+z|\,\varepsilon + 3C\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2.$$

By combining all these and recalling (4.16) and (4.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&G(f,x,z,\nu_x,\nu_z) + G(f,x,z,\varrho_x,\varrho_z) - 2f(x,z)\\
&\leq C\alpha(z)\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\left[\left(\frac{\tau+1}{2}\right)^2 - 1\right]\varepsilon + 4\alpha(x)\,|x+z|\,\varepsilon + 8\varepsilon^2\\
&\quad + (20 + 3C\gamma)\,|x-z|^{\gamma-2}\,\varepsilon^2\\
&\leq C\alpha(z)\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\left[\left(\frac{\tau+1}{2}\right)^2 - 1\right]\varepsilon + 8\varepsilon^2 + \left(\gamma + \frac{2}{C}\right)\gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\,\varepsilon\\
&\leq \gamma\,|x-z|^{\gamma-1}\,\varepsilon\left\{\gamma + 1 + C\alpha_{\min}\left[\left(\frac{\tau+1}{2}\right)^2 - 1\right]\right\} + 8\varepsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As in the previous case, we can choose the constant $C > 1$ large enough to ensure the negativity of the previous equation. Thus, the proof is complete.

5 Regularity near the boundary

In this section, we show that the value function of the game is also asymptotically continuous near the boundary, if we assume some regularity on the boundary of the set. The proof is based on finding a suitable barrier function and a strategy for the other player so that the process under the barrier function is super- or submartingale depending on the form of the function. Then, the result follows by analyzing the barrier function and iterating the argument.

Fix $r > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and define a barrier function

$$v(x) = a|x-z|^\sigma + b \tag{5.1}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}_r(z)$ with some constants $\sigma < 0$, $a < 0$ and $b \geq 0$. Recall the auxiliary function W defined in (2.3). First, we prove the following properties of the function v.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $r > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and define the function v as in (5.1) with constants $a < 0$, $b \geq 0$ and $\sigma < 0$. Then, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(v; x, \nu) \leq W\left(v; x, \varepsilon \frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\right) + C\varepsilon^3 \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &W\left(v; x, \varepsilon \frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\right) + W\left(v; x, -\varepsilon \frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\right) \\ &< 2v(x) + \varepsilon^2 a\sigma |x-z|^{\sigma-2}\Big(\beta(x) + \alpha(x)(\sigma-1)\Big) + C\varepsilon^3 \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}_r(z)$.

Proof. To establish the result, we apply Taylor's formula to the function v. The function v is real-analytic so we obtain by Taylor's formula

$$\begin{aligned} v(x+h) &= v(x) + \langle \nabla v(x), h\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle D^2 v(x)h, h\rangle + \mathcal{O}(|h|^3) \\ &= v(x) + \frac{1}{2} a\sigma |x-z|^{\sigma-2}\Bigg(2\langle x-z, h\rangle + |h|^2 \\ &\quad + (\sigma-2)\frac{\langle h, x-z\rangle^2}{|x-z|^2}\Bigg) + \mathcal{O}(|h|^3) \end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $C > 0$ be big enough so that $\left|\mathcal{O}(|h|^3)\right| \leq C\varepsilon^3$ for all $|h| \leq \varepsilon$. The function v is radially increasing, and the average integral over the first order term of v vanishes. In addition, we have

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon^{x-z}} \langle h, x-z\rangle^2 d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) = 0.$$

Thus, Taylor's formula proves the equation (5.2).

Next, we prove the equation (5.3). Recall the notations $V = \mathrm{span}\{x-z\}$ and the orthogonal complement $V^\perp$. For a vector $h \in V$ such that $h = (x-z)\varepsilon/|x-z|$, we get

$$v(x+h) \leq v(x) + \frac{1}{2} a\sigma |x-z|^{\sigma-2}\Big(2|x-z|\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2(\sigma-1)\Big) + C\varepsilon^3.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$v(x+h) + v(x-h) \leq 2v(x) + \varepsilon^2 a\sigma(\sigma-1)|x-z|^{\sigma-2} + C\varepsilon^3. \tag{5.4}$$

Also, for any vector $y \in B_\varepsilon^{z-x}$, we have $\langle y, x-z\rangle = 0$. Hence, by a short calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{x-z}} v(x+y)\, d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(y) &\leq v(x) + C\varepsilon^3 + \frac{1}{2} a\sigma |x-z|^{\sigma-2} \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{x-z}} |y|\ d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(y) \\ &= v(x) + C\varepsilon^3 + \frac{1}{2} a\sigma |x-z|^{\sigma-2}\varepsilon^2\left(\frac{n-1}{n+1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, this inequality together with $B_\varepsilon^{z-x} = B_\varepsilon^{x-z}$ and (5.4) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
&W\left(v; x, \varepsilon\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\right) + W\left(v; x, -\varepsilon\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\right) \\
&= \alpha(x)\left(v\left(x - \varepsilon\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\right) + v\left(x + \varepsilon\frac{x-z}{|x-z|}\right)\right) \\
&\quad + 2\beta(x) \fint_{B_\varepsilon^{z-x}} v(x+\tilde{h})\, d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(\tilde{h}) \\
&\leq 2v(x) + \varepsilon^2 a\sigma|x-z|^{\sigma-2}\Big(\beta(x) + \alpha(x)(\sigma-1)\Big) + 2C\varepsilon^3. \qquad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we prove the main theorem of this section. To get the result, we need to assume some regularity on the boundary of the set Ω.

Boundary Regularity Condition. *There are universal constants $r_0, s \in (0,1)$ such that for all $r \in (0, r_0]$ and $y \in \partial\Omega$ there exists a ball*

$$B_{sr}(z) \subset B_r(y) \setminus \Omega$$

for some $z \in B_r(y) \setminus \Omega$.

Assume that the set Ω satisfies this boundary condition. Then, the following theorem holds. In the proof, we modify the idea from the paper [MPR12], where the constant p case is covered (see also [PS08]).

Theorem 5.2. *Let $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in (0, r_0]$ with $r_0 \in (0,1)$ and the ball $B_{sr}(z) \subset B_r(y) \setminus \Omega$ given by the boundary regularity condition. Let u be the solution to (1.1) with continuous boundary data F. Then for all $\eta > 0$, there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ such that*

$$u(x_0) - \sup_{B_{4r}(z)\cap\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}} F < \eta \tag{5.5}$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 < 1$ and $x_0 \in B_{4^{1-k}r}(y) \cap \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$.

Proof. The idea is to find a suitable barrier function so that by Lemma 5.1, if P_{I} pulls towards the point $z \in B_r(y) \setminus \Omega$, the game process inside the barrier function is a supermartingale. Then by utilizing the properties of the barrier function, we get the result by iteration.

Choose a constant $0 < \theta < 1$, independent of r, such that

$$\theta := \frac{s^\sigma - 2^\sigma}{s^\sigma - 4^\sigma}$$

with the parameter $s > 0$ from the boundary condition and a parameter $\sigma < 0$ that will be defined later. We extend the function F continuously to

the set $\Gamma_{1,1}$ and use the same notation for the extension. Then, we choose $k \geq 1$ big enough such that

$$\theta^k\Big(\sup_{\Gamma_{1,1}} F - \inf_{\Gamma_{1,1}} F\Big) < \eta.$$

In addition, we denote the constants

$$b_U := \sup_{\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}} F$$

and

$$b_{4r} := \sup_{B_{4r}(z)\cap\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}} F.$$

Thus for the chosen k, independent of ε, it holds

$$\theta^k\big(b_U - b_{4r}\big) < \eta. \tag{5.6}$$

We define a function v_k such that

$$v_k(x) = a|x - z|^\sigma + b$$

in $B_{4^{2-k}r}(z) \setminus \overline{B}_{4^{1-k}sr}(z)$. The constants $a \leq 0$ and $b \geq 0$ can be calculated from the boundary values

$$v_k = \begin{cases} b_{4r} + \theta^{k-1}\big(b_U - b_{4r}\big) & \text{on } \partial B_{4^{2-k}r}(z) \\ b_{4r} & \text{on } \partial B_{4^{1-k}sr}(z). \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

If $b_U = b_{4r}$, it holds $a = 0$ and $b = b_U$. Otherwise, the values are $a < 0$ and $b \geq 0$. We consider the case with $a < 0$, since the proof of the other case is clear.

We extend the function v_k to the set $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{B}_{4^{1-k}sr-2\varepsilon}(z)$ and use the same notation for the extension. We may assume that $x_0 \in \Omega$, and observe that

$$x_0 \in B_{4^{1-k}r}(y) \cap \Omega \subset \Omega \cap B_{2\cdot 4^{1-k}r}(z) \setminus \overline{B}_{4^{1-k}sr}(z). \tag{5.8}$$

Assume that P_{II} plays the game by pulling towards the point z given a turn i.e. he moves the game token by the vector $-\varepsilon(x_m - z)/|x_m - z|$, if he wins the mth toss. This strategy is denoted by $\mathcal{S}^*_{\mathrm{II}}$. Also, fix a strategy for P_{I} and denote it by $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}$.

By using Lemma 5.1 for all $m \geq 1$, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}^*_{\mathrm{II}}}\big[v_k(x_{m+1})|x_0,\dots,x_m\big] \\
&\leq \frac{1-\delta(x_m)}{2}\left(\sup_{|\nu|=\varepsilon} W(v_k;x_m,\nu) + W\left(v_k;x_m,-\varepsilon\frac{x_m-z}{|x_m-z|}\right)\right) \\
&\quad + \delta(x_m)F(x_m) \\
&\leq \frac{1-\delta(x_m)}{2}\Bigg(2v_k(x_m) + \varepsilon^2 a\sigma|x_m-z|^{\sigma-2}\cdot \\
&\qquad\qquad \cdot\big(\beta(x_m)+\alpha(x_m)(\sigma-1)\big) + 2C\varepsilon^3\Bigg) \\
&\quad + \delta(x_m)F(x_m)
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. Next, we need to choose the constant $\sigma < 0$ small enough. Recall that $\alpha_{\min} > 0$. Let us fix the value

$$\sigma := \frac{2}{\alpha_{\min}}(\alpha_{\min}-1)$$

implying

$$\beta(x_m) + \alpha(x_m)(\sigma-1) < -1$$

for all $x_m \in \Omega$. In addition, we have

$$a\sigma|x_m-z|^{\sigma-2} > a\sigma\big(\operatorname{diam}(\Omega)+1\big)^{\sigma-2} > 0$$

for all $x_m \in \Omega$. Thus by choosing $\varepsilon_0 := \varepsilon_0(\alpha_{\min}, r, \Omega, k) > 0$ small enough, we can ensure that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}},\mathcal{S}^*_{\mathrm{II}}}[v_k(x_{m+1})|x_0,\dots,x_m] &\leq \big(1-\delta(x_m)\big)v_k(x_m) + \delta(x_m)F(x_m) \\
&\leq v_k(x_m)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. We have shown that the process

$$M_m := v_k(x_m)$$

is a supermartingale, when P_{II} uses the strategy $\mathcal{S}^*_{\mathrm{II}}$ and P_{I} uses any strategy $\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{I}}$.

Define a boundary function $F_{v_k} : \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$F_{v_k} = v_k|_{\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}}.$$

By Theorem 3.7, we have $u = u_{\mathrm{I}}$ with u_{I} the value function for P_{I} defined in (2.6). Since $F \leq F_{v_k}$, $(M_m)_{m=1}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale, F_{v_k} is bounded and

$\tau < \infty$ almost surely, we can estimate with the help of the optimal stopping theorem

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_0) &= \sup_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{I}} \inf_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{II}} \mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{I},\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{II}}\big[F(x_\tau)\big] \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{I}} \mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{I},\mathcal{S}^*_\mathrm{II}}\big[F(x_\tau)\big] \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{I}} \mathbb{E}^{x_0}_{\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{I},\mathcal{S}^*_\mathrm{II}}\big[F_{v_k}(x_\tau)\big] \\ &\leq v_k(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

By using the boundary values (5.7), we can calculate the constants a and b in the function v_k and deduce by (5.8) that

$$v_k(x_0) \leq b_{4r} + \theta^k\big(b_U - b_{4r}\big).$$

Hence by (5.6), we have shown the estimate (5.5). □

Corollary 5.3. *Let $\eta > 0$ and let u be the solution to (1.1) with continuous boundary data F. Then, there is a constant $\overline{r} \in (0, r_0]$ such that for all $r \in (0, \overline{r}]$ there exist constants $k \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $y \in \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ it holds*

$$u(x_0) - F(y) < \eta$$

for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $x_0 \in B_{4^{1-k}r}(y) \cap \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$.

Proof. First, assume that $y \in \partial\Omega$. Theorem 5.2 implies that for any $r \in (0, r_0]$, there are constants $k \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$u(x_0) - \sup_{B_{4r}(z)\cap\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}} F < \frac{\eta}{10}$$

for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $x_0 \in B_{4^{1-k}r}(y) \cap \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$. Let $y^* \in \overline{B}_{4r}(z) \cap \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ be such that

$$\sup_{B_{4r}(z)\cap\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}} F < F(y^*) + \frac{\eta}{10}.$$

The boundary function F is continuous on the compact set $\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$, so there is a modulus of continuity ω_F for the function F. Thus, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} u(x_0) - F(y) &= u_\varepsilon(x_0) - F(y^*) + F(y^*) - F(y) \\ &< u - \sup_{B_{4r}(z)\cap\Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}} F + \frac{\eta}{10} + \omega_F\big(|y^* - y|\big) \\ &< \frac{\eta}{5} + \omega_F\big(|y^* - y|\big). \end{aligned}$$

It holds $|z - y| < r$ implying the estimate $|y^* - y| \leq |y^* - z| + |z - y| < 5r$. We choose $\overline{r} > 0$ so small that

$$\omega_F(5r) < \frac{\eta}{10}$$

for all $r < \overline{r}$. This yields that for any $r < \overline{r}$, we have

$$u(x_0) - F(y) < \frac{\eta}{2}$$

for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $x_0 \in B_{4^{1-k}r}(y) \cap \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$.

Next, assume that $y \notin \partial\Omega$. Pick a point $y_b \in \partial\Omega$ such that $y \in B_\varepsilon(y_b)$. We choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so small that

$$\omega_F(\varepsilon_0) < \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

This implies that

$$\big|F(y) - F(y_b)\big| \leq \omega_F\big(|y - y_b|\big) < \frac{\eta}{2}$$

for all $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$. Since $y_b \in \partial\Omega$, we can use the estimates above to get the result. □

Remark 5.4. By using a similar argument to Theorem 5.2, we have for all $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $\eta > 0$ that there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ such that

$$u(x_0) - \inf_{B_{4r}(z) \cap \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}} F > -\eta$$

for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0 < 1$ and $x_0 \in B_{4^{1-k}r}(y) \cap \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$. Hence, we have for all $r > 0$ small enough, $k \geq 1$ big enough and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough the lower bound

$$u(x_0) - F(y) > -\eta$$

for $y \in \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ and $x_0 \in B_{4^{1-k}r}(y) \cap \overline{\Omega}_\varepsilon$.

6 Application

In this section, we prove that the uniform limit of functions satisfying (1.1) as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is a weak solution to the normalized homogeneous $p(x)$-Laplace equation

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^N_{p(x)} u(x) &:= \Delta u(x) + \big(p(x) - 2\big)\Delta^N_\infty u(x) \\ &= \Delta u(x) - \Delta^N_\infty u(x) + \big(p(x) - 1\big)\Delta^N_\infty u(x) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

This equation is in a non divergence form so we define weak solutions via viscosity theory. There is a related version of the equation (6.1), called a strong $p(x)$-Laplacian, in a divergence form, which has recently received attention and studied using distributional weak theory (see for example [AH11, ZZ12, PL13]). For some questions, the viscosity point of view is

very natural in the sense that the equation (6.1) has the Pucci operator bounds used for example in Section 4 in [CC95].

We define for all vectors $x, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and symmetric $n \times n$ matrices X

$$\mathbb{F}_{p(x)}(x,h,X) := \operatorname{trace}(X) - \sum_{i,j}^{n} \frac{h_i h_j}{|h|^2} X_{ij} + \big(p(x)-1\big) \sum_{i,j}^{n} \frac{h_i h_j}{|h|^2} X_{ij}.$$

These functions are discontinuous, when $h = 0$. Therefore, we define viscosity solutions via semicontinuous extensions. For more details about the extensions, see for example [Gig06, ES91]. We denote by $\lambda_{\min}(X)$ and by $\lambda_{\max}(X)$ the smallest and the largest eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix X.

Definition 6.1. A continuous function $u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution to the equation (6.1), if for all $x \in \Omega$ and $\phi \in C^2$ such that $u(x) = \phi(x)$ and $u(y) > \phi(y)$ for $y \neq x$ we have

$$\begin{cases} 0 \;\geq\; \mathbb{F}_{p(x)}(x, \nabla\phi(x), D^2\phi(x)), & \text{if} \quad \nabla\phi(x) \neq 0, \\ 0 \;\geq\; \lambda_{\min}((p(x)-2)D^2\phi(x)) + \operatorname{trace}(D^2\phi(x)), & \text{if} \quad \nabla\phi(x) = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.2}$$

We also require that for all $x \in \Omega$ and $\phi \in C^2$ such that $u(x) = \phi(x)$ and $u(y) < \phi(y)$ for $y \neq x$ all the inequalities are reversed, and we use $\lambda_{\max}$ in the role of $\lambda_{\min}$.

It is equivalent to require that $u - \phi$ has a local strict minimum at x instead of $u(x) = \phi(x)$ and $u(y) > \phi(y)$ for $y \neq x$ (see for example [Koi04]). Next, we prove that by passing to a subsequence if necessary, the value function of the game converges uniformly to a solution of the equation (6.1). To prove that the limiting function u is a viscosity solution to (6.1), we use an argument similar to the stability principle for viscosity solutions. We apply the DPP (1.1) for a test function $\phi \in C^2$, and deduce the connection by utilizing the uniform convergence.

Theorem 6.2. *Let u_ε denote the unique continuous solution to (1.1) with $\varepsilon > 0$ and with a continuous boundary function $F : \Gamma_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \to \mathbb{R}$. Then, there are a function $u : \overline{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}$ and a subsequence $\{\varepsilon_i\}$ such that u_{ε_i} converges uniformly to u on $\overline{\Omega}$ and the function u is a viscosity solution to (6.1) with the boundary data F.*

Proof. To find the function u, we use a variant of the Arzelà-Ascoli's theorem (see for example [MPR12, p. 15-16]). By Theorems 4.1 and 5.2 together with Remark 5.4, the assumptions for Arzelà-Ascoli's theorem are satisfied and hence, there exist a continuous function u on $\overline{\Omega}$ with the boundary values F and a subsequence $\{\varepsilon_i\}$ such that $u_{\varepsilon_i} \to u$ uniformly on $\overline{\Omega}$ as $i \to \infty$. Thus, it is enough to show that u is a viscosity solution to (6.1).

Let $x \in \Omega$ and $\phi \in C^2$ such that $u - \phi$ has a strict local minimum at x. Then, we have

$$\inf_{B_r(x)} (u - \phi) = u(x) - \phi(x) < u(z) - \phi(z)$$

for some $r > 0$ and for all $z \in B_r(x) \setminus \{x\}$. The uniform convergence yields

$$\inf_{B_r(x)} (u_\varepsilon - \phi) < u_\varepsilon(z) - \phi(z)$$

for all $z \in B_r(x) \setminus \{x\}$ and for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Thus, we can use the definition of the infimum and deduce that for all $\eta_\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a point $x_\varepsilon \in B_r(x) \subset \Omega$ such that

$$u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) - \phi(x_\varepsilon) \leq u_\varepsilon(z) - \phi(z) + \eta_\varepsilon$$

for all $z \in B_r(x)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough with $x_\varepsilon \to x$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We define $\varphi := \phi + u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) - \phi(x_\varepsilon)$ so that

$$\varphi(x_\varepsilon) = u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) \text{ and } u_\varepsilon(z) \geq \varphi(z) - \eta_\varepsilon$$

for all $z \in B_r(x)$. Therefore, these together with the fact that u_ε is a solution to (1.1) imply

$$\begin{aligned} u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) = T_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) &\geq T_\varepsilon \varphi(x_\varepsilon) - (1 - \delta(x_\varepsilon))\eta_\varepsilon \\ &= T_\varepsilon \phi(x_\varepsilon) - \eta_\varepsilon + u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) - \phi(x_\varepsilon) + \delta(x_\varepsilon)\Lambda_\varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the monotonicity of T_ε and denote $\Lambda_\varepsilon := \eta_\varepsilon + \phi(x_\varepsilon) - u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon)$. This inequality yields

$$\eta_\varepsilon \geq T_\varepsilon \phi(x_\varepsilon) - \phi(x_\varepsilon) + \delta(x_\varepsilon)\Lambda_\varepsilon. \tag{6.3}$$

By the Taylor's expansion of ϕ at x_ε with $|\nu| = 1$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\phi(x_\varepsilon + \varepsilon\nu) + \frac{1}{2}\phi(x_\varepsilon - \varepsilon\nu) = \phi(x_\varepsilon) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)\nu, \nu\rangle + o(\varepsilon^2), \tag{6.4}$$

$$\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} \phi(x_\varepsilon + h) d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) = \phi(x_\varepsilon) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(n+1)}\Delta_{\nu^\perp}\phi(x_\varepsilon) + o(\varepsilon^2). \tag{6.5}$$

In (6.5), we utilize the orthonormal basis $\mathcal{V}$ including ν and an orthonormal basis for $\nu^\perp$ to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} \langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)h, h\rangle d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(n+1)}\Delta_{\nu^\perp}\phi(x_\varepsilon)$$

in a similar way to [MPR10]. Here, the operator $\Delta_{\nu^\perp}$ denotes the Laplacian on the plane $\nu^\perp$ i.e.

$$\Delta_{\nu^\perp}\phi(x_\varepsilon) = \sum_{j=2}^{n} \langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)\nu_j, \nu_j\rangle$$

with $\nu_2, \dots, \nu_n$ the orthonormal basis vectors for $\nu^\perp$. Observe that

$$\Delta\phi(z) = \operatorname{trace}(D^2\phi(z)) = \Delta_{\nu^\perp}\phi(z) + \langle D^2\phi(z)\nu, \nu\rangle \tag{6.6}$$

for any $|\nu| = 1$ and $z \in \Omega$. To see this, we apply the orthonormal basis $\mathcal{V}$ and a change of variables $x_1 = \nu, x_2 = \nu_2, \dots, x_n = \nu_n$. Then, we deduce the equation (6.6) by the chain rule.

There exists a vector $\nu_{\min} := \nu_{\min}(\varepsilon)$ minimizing

$$\alpha(x_\varepsilon)\phi(x_\varepsilon + \varepsilon\nu) + \beta(x_\varepsilon)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu} \phi(x_\varepsilon + h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) \tag{6.7}$$

with $|\nu| = 1$. Thus by (6.4) and (6.5) with $\nu = \nu_{\min}$ and the fact that $-\nu^\perp \equiv \nu^\perp$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
T_\varepsilon\phi(x_\varepsilon) &= \frac{1-\delta(x_\varepsilon)}{2}\sup_{|\nu|=1}\left(\alpha(x_\varepsilon)\phi(x_\varepsilon+\varepsilon\nu) + \beta(x_\varepsilon)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu}\phi(x_\varepsilon+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{1-\delta(x_\varepsilon)}{2}\inf_{|\nu|=1}\left(\alpha(x_\varepsilon)\phi(x_\varepsilon+\varepsilon\nu) + \beta(x_\varepsilon)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^\nu}\phi(x_\varepsilon+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h)\right)\\
&\quad + \delta(x_\varepsilon)F(x_\varepsilon)\\
&\geq (1-\delta(x_\varepsilon))\frac{\alpha(x_\varepsilon)}{2}\left\{\phi(x_\varepsilon+\varepsilon\nu_{\min}) + \phi(x_\varepsilon - \varepsilon\nu_{\min})\right\}\\
&\quad + (1-\delta(x_\varepsilon))\beta(x_\varepsilon)\fint_{B_\varepsilon^{\nu_{\min}}}\phi(x_\varepsilon+h)d\mathcal{L}^{n-1}(h) + \delta(x_\varepsilon)F(x_\varepsilon) + o(\varepsilon^2)\\
&= (1-\delta(x_\varepsilon))\phi(x_\varepsilon)\\
&\quad + (1-\delta(x_\varepsilon))\frac{\beta(x_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^2}{2(n+1)}\Big\{\Delta_{\nu_{\min}^\perp}\phi(x_\varepsilon)\\
&\qquad\qquad + (p(x_\varepsilon)-1)\langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)\nu_{\min}, \nu_{\min}\rangle\Big\}\\
&\quad + \delta(x_\varepsilon)F(x_\varepsilon) + o(\varepsilon^2).
\end{aligned}$$

By this estimate and (6.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_\varepsilon \geq\ & -\phi(x_\varepsilon) + (1-\delta(x_\varepsilon))\Bigg\{\phi(x_\varepsilon) + \frac{\beta(x_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^2}{2(n+1)}\Big[\Delta_{\nu_{\min}^\perp}\phi(x_\varepsilon)\\
&\qquad + (p(x_\varepsilon)-1)\langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)\nu_{\min}, \nu_{\min}\rangle\Big]\Bigg\}\\
&+ \delta(x_\varepsilon)\big(F(x_\varepsilon) + \Lambda_\varepsilon\big) + o(\varepsilon^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

First, assume that $|\nabla\phi(x)| \neq 0$. Then by $x_\varepsilon \to x$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, it turns out that

$$\nu_{\min} \to -\frac{\nabla\phi(x)}{|\nabla\phi(x)|} =: \nu_{\min}^* \tag{6.9}$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Here, we need the fact that $\alpha_{\min} > 0$ i.e. $p_{\min} > 1$. In addition by (6.6), we have

$$\Delta_{(\nu^*_{\min})^\perp}\phi(x) + (p(x)-1)\langle D^2\phi(x)\nu^*_{\min}, \nu^*_{\min}\rangle = \Delta^N_{p(x)}\phi(x). \tag{6.10}$$

Choose $\eta_\varepsilon = o(\varepsilon^2)$, divide both sides in (6.8) by ε^2 and let $\varepsilon \to 0$. Therefore by (6.8), (6.9), (6.10) and the facts that $x_\varepsilon \to x$ and $\delta(x_\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-2} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain

$$0 \geq \frac{\beta(x)}{2(n+1)}\Delta^N_{p(x)}\phi(x).$$

By $\beta(x) \geq \beta_{\min} > 0$, we get the inequality $\Delta^N_{p(x)}\phi(x) \leq 0$.

Next, assume that $|\nabla\phi(x)| = 0$. By (6.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta_{\nu^\perp_{\min}}\phi(x_\varepsilon) + (p(x_\varepsilon)-1)\langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)\nu_{\min}, \nu_{\min}\rangle \\ &= \Delta\phi(x) + (p(x_\varepsilon)-2)\langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)\nu_{\min}, \nu_{\min}\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

Assume that $p(x) > 2$. Then by the continuity of p and $x_\varepsilon \to x$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we have $p(x_\varepsilon) > 2$ for all ε small enough. Thus, we can estimate

$$(p(x_\varepsilon)-2)\langle D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon)\nu_{\min}, \nu_{\min}\rangle \geq (p(x_\varepsilon)-2)\lambda_{\min}(D^2\phi(x_\varepsilon))$$

for all ε small enough. As above, this estimate together with (6.8), (6.11) and the continuity of $z \mapsto \lambda_{\min}(D^2\phi(z))$ imply

$$0 \geq \Delta\phi(x) + \lambda_{\min}((p(x)-2)D^2\phi(x)).$$

The cases $p(x) = 2$ and $p(x) < 2$ can be treated in a similar fashion.

To show the required reverse inequality, we choose $|\nu_{\max}| = 1$ such that it maximizes (6.7), and we consider the reverse inequality with $\phi \in C^2$ such that $u - \phi$ has a strict maximum at x. The proof is analogous to the above. □

References

[AH11] T. Adamowicz and P. Hästö. Harnack's inequality and the strong $p(\cdot)$-Laplacian. *J. Differential Equations*, 250(3):1631–1649, 2011.

[CC95] L. A. Caffarelli and X. Cabré. *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations*, volume 43 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.

[ES91] L. C. Evans and J. Spruck. Motion of level sets by mean curvature. I. *J. Differential Geom.*, 33(3):635–681, 1991.

[Gig06] Y. Giga. *Surface evolution equations. A level set approach*, volume 99 of *Monographs in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2006.

[Har16] H. Hartikainen. A dynamic programming principle with continuous solutions related to the p-Laplacian, $1 < p < \infty$. *Differential Integral Equations*, 29(5-6):583–600, 2016.

[IL90] H. Ishii and P.-L. Lions. Viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order elliptic partial differential equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 83(1):26–78, 1990.

[KMP12] B. Kawohl, J. J. Manfredi, and M. Parviainen. Solutions of nonlinear PDEs in the sense of averages. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 97(2):173–188, 2012.

[Koi04] S. Koike. *A beginner's guide to the theory of viscosity solutions*, volume 13 of *MSJ Memoirs*. Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 2004.

[Kus15] S. Kusuoka. Hölder continuity and bounds for fundamental solutions to nondivergence form parabolic equations. *Anal. PDE*, 8(1):1–32, 2015.

[LP] H. Luiro and M. Parviainen. Regularity for nonlinear stochastic games. Preprint arxiv: https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.07263.

[LPS13] H. Luiro, M. Parviainen, and E. Saksman. Harnack's inequality for p-harmonic functions via stochastic games. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 38(11):1985–2003, 2013.

[LPS14] H. Luiro, M. Parviainen, and E. Saksman. On the existence and uniqueness of p-harmonious functions. *Differential Integral Equations*, 27(3/4):201–216, 2014.

[LR86] T. Lindvall and L. C. G. Rogers. Coupling of multidimensional diffusions by reflection. *Ann. Probab.*, 14(3):860–872, 1986.

[MPR10] J.J. Manfredi, M. Parviainen, and J.D. Rossi. An asymptotic mean value characterization for p-harmonic functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 258:713–728, 2010.

[MPR12] J.J. Manfredi, M. Parviainen, and J.D. Rossi. On the definition and properties of p-harmonious functions. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.*, 11(2):215–241, 2012.

[PL13] M. Pérez-Llanos. A homogenization process for the strong $p(x)$-Laplacian. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 76:105–114, 2013.

[PP13] A. Porretta and E. Priola. Global Lipschitz regularizing effects for linear and nonlinear parabolic equations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 100(5):633–686, 2013.

[PS08] Y. Peres and S. Sheffield. Tug-of-war with noise: a game-theoretic view of the p-Laplacian. *Duke Math. J.*, 145(1):91–120, 2008.

[PSSW09] Y. Peres, O. Schramm, S. Sheffield, and D. B. Wilson. Tug-of-war and the infinity Laplacian. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 22(1):167–210, 2009.

[PW06] E. Priola and F.-Y. Wang. Gradient estimates for diffusion semigroups with singular coefficients. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 236(1):244–264, 2006.

[Sri98] S. M. Srivastava. *A course on Borel sets*, volume 180 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.

[ZZ12] C. Zhang and S. Zhou. Hölder regularity for the gradients of solutions of the strong $p(x)$-Laplacian. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 389(2):1066 – 1077, 2012.

Departament de Matemàtiques, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra Barcelona, Spain
E-mail address: arroyo@mat.uab.cat

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Jyväskylä, PO Box 35, FI-40014 Jyväskylä, Finland
E-mail address: joonas.heino@jyu.fi

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Jyväskylä, PO Box 35, FI-40014 Jyväskylä, Finland
E-mail address: mikko.j.parviainen@jyu.fi